UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

Notes on Economic Recovery

By JOSEPH ERNEST McAFEE

The Evolution of the Soul

By LOUIS L. MANN

Government As a Racket

By C. GUILLET

VOLUME CVIII NUMBER 20

Chicago, February 1, 1932

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago. Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 315
Notes on Economic Recovery—JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE 317
Jottings—J. H. H 319

ARTICLES—

The Evolution of the Soul—LOUIS L. MANN 320
Government as a Racket—C. GUILLET 326

POETRY—

Julius Rosenwald—JEROME ALEXANDER 315
Contrast—A. B. LEIGH 327

CORRESPONDENCE—

British Reign of Terror in India—TARAKNATH DAS 327
A Third Party—DEVERE ALLEN 327
Money and Idealism—LYDIA G. WENTWORTH 327

THE FIELD—

Peace Principles for Lenten Season 314

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Peace Principles

"Glory to God in the highest and on earth peace among men"

Prepared by a group in Geneva for private devotions and group meditation. Ascribed to the Disarmament Conference.

Foreword

The opening of the Disarmament Conference, February 2nd, in Geneva, is almost coincident with the beginning of the Lenten Season, February 10th.

As the season of Lent is one of self-examination, of penitence, of deep humiliation and highest joy, the people of the world will at that time most easily come into sympathetic touch with mankind's search for peace and freedom from armaments.

This little book is intended to supply—until Easter—a daily vision of eternal truth, and present some principles necessary for gaining real peace among the nations. It is commended to individuals and editors—as well as to the delegates to the Conference, to whom it is ascribed.

The keynote of the booklet is, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men." This keynote is commended as a sermon-topic, on Sunday, January 31st—the Sunday before the opening of the Conference.

February, 1932

1. And they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore. Ish. 2:4.

2. *Disarmament Conference opens.*
Cast out first the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast the mote out of thy brother's eye. Matt. 7:2.

3. Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you: even so do ye also unto them. Matt. 7:12.

4. Let him that is without sin among you cast the first stone. John 8:7.

5. Forgive us our debts, as we forgive every man that is indebted to us. Matt. 6:12.

6. The measure you deal out to others will be dealt out to yourselves. Matt. 7:2.

7. *Sunday.*
Bring no more vain oblations: it is an offering of abomination unto me. Your hands are full of blood: wash you, make you clean. Cease to do evil. Ish. 1:13,16.

8. If you love them that love you, what reward have you? Even the heathen do that. Matt. 5:46.

9. What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul? Matt. 16:26.

10. *Lent begins.*
And the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and showed him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them; and said, All

(*Continued on page* 328)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CVIII MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1932 Number 20

JULIUS ROSENWALD

Humble, penniless, alone,
I come, Almighty, to Thy throne.
My effort all unfinished stands,
Though taken up by loving hands.
O judge me not by words or creeds,
But by my strivings, limned in deeds.

Alone? With you, in mingled hum,
The murmured thanks of millions come.
You are not penniless, who gave
Freely, your fellows' lives to save;
Nor even humble, for you led
While giving with hand, heart, and head.
Your soul, transcending race and creeds,
Looms larger than your splendid deeds.

JEROME ALEXANDER

It is difficult to know what the British censor was thinking about in releasing to the world the recent Associated Press story about the arrest of the nine-year old boy, Krishna Kant, and his sentencing to prison for four years for the crime of picketing against British goods. The explanation is probably to be found in the fact that this censor, like all other members of his tribe, is essentially stupid, and thus actually convinced himself that this story would help the British Government in India by showing the world that it was going to suppress the revolution and have no nonsense about it. But of all the things that have happened in India since Gandhi's arrest, nothing has so shocked the world as this ferocious treatment of the little nine-year old patriot. When Britain descends to the barbarism of waging war not only against men and women, but also against little children, she reveals the desperation of her cause and her own unworthiness to remain within the pale of civilization. But the fundamental significance of this dreadful episode is to be found in the clearness with which, like a flash of lightning, it illuminates the landscape of revolutionary India. "I am ready to die for Gandhi," cried the little boy when sentenced by the British magistrate to his four years doom in jail. When children thus rise up to resist tyrants, when thousands of women leave their secluded homes and patrol the streets in vindication of their cause, when leaders of Indian life, the noblest of the land, give themselves gladly to imprisonment and even death for their country's liberty, what chance has the Empire to maintain her rule? Gandhi has lifted a torch which has kindled all India to conflagration. More than three hundred millions of people are aroused, and under the leadership of their sainted Mahatma are dedicated to the disciplined non-violent resistance against their alien masters. All the power of the greatest empire of modern times must in the end be as helpless against this flood of revolution as Mrs. Partington's broom against the Atlantic Ocean. Now that the fight has been joined, India's victory, though at a great price, is assured.

The European situation is fast approaching its crisis, the long-promised crisis of February and March. The prospect could not be much darker, but even in the darkness there has been a clearing of the air, thanks to Chancellor Bruening's straightforward statement that Germany is through with reparations. If this could be followed by an equally straightforward cancellation of the war debts, there might be some good hope for the future. But there are few indications of enough sanity in the world for any such honest facing of facts as this. Bruening's hands were forced, of course, by the waxing power of the Hitlerites. If he thinks, however, that any such eleventh-hour concessions as this are going to satisfy the "Nazis," he is very much mistaken. The refusal of both Hitler and Hugenberg to agree to the idea of making Hindenberg perpetual president is significant of their growing sense of power. What sustains them, of course, is the mounting flood of economic misery in Germany—that flood which crosses all frontiers, overflows all tariff barriers, and in due course, unless all signs fail, will engulf our western world in final disaster. Meanwhile, Briand retires, Laval resigns and resumes, Mussolini raves, and MacDonald totters beneath the crushing load of British ruin. It's a terrific picture, this panorama of European life today. And, America either cannot, or will not, see it! Yet we also are moving toward collapse. Our losses in Germany will amount to not less than $4,000,000,000, all good money taken right out of our pockets. Unemployment increases as business decreases; cities and towns are one after another going bankrupt in the face of calamity; neither our states nor the nation itself can find funds to meet the crisis; crushing programs of new taxation are proposed, only to be thrown aside in

terror; banks keep right on failing and closing; and the leaders of the people are "blind leaders of the blind." To one who can take an objective view, the situation is the most exciting since 1914. But such view, possible to Martians, is hardly possible to inhabitants of this earth.

The Hawaiian affair is a damnable mess. Corrupt politics, race prejudice, lawlessness, rape, murder, mob violence—what ingredients for a devil's brew! The assault on Mrs. Massie was a dastardly outrage. But it was preceded by the loathsome superiority complex of the white man in the tropics which stirs natives to revolt; and it was followed by a fierce crime of anarchic vengeance which assaults society as truly as the male brutes assaulted their helpless victim. Here, as usual in such cases, we have crime following crime, violence breeding violence, with government incompetent to rule or even hold respect. What a disgrace we Americans make of government any way! Imagine our telling the Filipinos that they are unfit for self-rule, or sending marines to Nicaragua to establish order! If our citizens have done anything but fail in their control of their own public affairs, then let us forget bankrupt Chicago and Philadelphia, corrupt New York and Boston, addled Washington, our Prohibition lawlessness, our lynchings, our bandits, our bank failures, our starving poor, our disgusting rich, and all our other evidences of a degenerate society. As for Honolulu, it is nothing exceptional. It is only one more festering sore on the rotten body of our American state. But it must be treated and healed, though other boils as bad must soon appear, but not by methods of riot and disorder jauntily suggested by Admiral Pratt. If anything could be worse than what has actually occurred, it would be the army and navy running amuck among a helpless population. Let us know, first, what has been going on—what these lordly whites have been doing to stir a racial feeling which pervades a native population to hail the vile rapers of white women as heroes. Then let us find out how justice is administered in these islands—perhaps as badly as in the United States itself! Then get after the politicians who are always quick to "divide and rule" for purposes of profit. These things done, we will have made a beginning of our problem.

The tragedy of labor at this hour is pathetic. Wages are everywhere going to smash—the carefully built-up standards of a generation being ruthlessly destroyed. Unemployment is decimating the ranks of the trade unions. Hunger and misery are eating up the relief funds garnered in the years of prosperity. Another year of this distress, and labor will be stripped of nearly all the gains achieved by years of battle and sacrifice. Losses at such a time as this are of course to a certain degree inevitable. But there is no question that selfish capital is deliberately taking advantage of the situation to "break" labor, and thus render it again as helpless as in the good old days before the workingmen were organized. The unions are meanwhile trying desperately to salvage something from the wreck, and see their best hope in gaining a reduction of hours to balance the reduction of wages. Hence the cry for the five-day week and the six-hour day! But suppose labor achieves this gain under the stress of present unemployment. How long would the gain be held after business improved and the "slack" was caught up? About as long as wages were kept up after the depression set in! Labor, after all, is responsible for its own disasters. Nothing but its own stupidity has brought it to the present pass. For organized labor, at least in America, has been perfectly content to leave the employers in the seats of power, and has undertaken nothing more fundamental than to wrest from these employers rich favors as their own show of power might exact. Labor, in other words, has left all the cards in capitalist hands, and has insanely expected to win its share of the earnings when the game went wrong. Things don't happen that way—not in this capitalist world of cut-throat competition for profit and loss. Unless and until organized labor gains political power, and takes over the control of industry, it can expect nothing but such fate as has now befallen it.

But, we hear some reader exclaiming after a perusal of the above editorial, labor has gained political power in Germany and England and other countries, and the workers are just as badly off as they are in America! Very true—and for a reason which it will do us good to explore. We have just said that organized labor could achieve no permanent improvement of its condition, unless and until it gained political power and took over the control of industry. Now it is significant to note that in Germany and England, and elsewhere, while the great trade unions have captured the governmental power, they have steadfastly refused to use the power thus won, to capture industry. Labor has taken the first step on the road, but not the second. The Social Democrats in Germany, for example, have been perfectly satisfied, apparently, with the existing capitalistic regime. At least they have acted exactly as any conventional, middle-class government would act under similar conditions. The same is true in England! The Labor Government was in office for a period of two years, and never once introduced a bill, or even made an official speech, to the end of carrying out the principles of the Labor Party platform. Mr. MacDonald, so far as his cabinet policies were concerned, was nothing more nor less than a rather conservative Liberal. Mr.

Snowden, in his budgets, carried the mind of England back to the good old Victorian days of Gladstone and Salisbury. Of course, these are trying times—no time, perhaps, to bring in the Socialistic state! But when is it ever improper to do the right—and when is Socialism ever so much needed as in the hour when capitalism is breaking up? In any case, labor cannot expect to gain anything from the possession of political power unless it is willing to use this power in the interest of labor. In politics, as in golf, one has got to "carry through" one's drive.

The life of the late Bishop Gore, of England, is a perfect illustration of how little theological beliefs amount to in the character and value of a life. This Bishop was an Anglican of the extreme high church variety. He believed everything that is abhorrent and impossible to the liberal mind. He believed not crudely and ignorantly, as the typical Fundamentalist believes, but, since he was a scholar, he believed intelligently, reverently, and sincerely. Yet what he believed came straight out of the Dark Ages. But so also, so to speak, did his saintliness. The life of this good bishop was as lively as his ideas were antiquated. He seemed to understand the principles of Jesus' teaching, apart from all dogmas of Christ's person, and was resolute to heed them. Thus, he never married, but in strict accord with his doctrinal belief in the celibacy of the clergy, remained single all his days. When Bishop of Worcester in 1902-1904, he deserted his episcopal residence in the stately old cathedral city, and went to live in Birmingham, in modest and unattractive lodgings, where he felt the burden of his labors lay. While Bishop of Oxford, he tried to sell or rent his official residence, on the ground that he had no use for its worldly splendor. Gore's chief and enduring reputation, of course, is to be found in the field of scholarship. His books were works of rare distinction, and earned him honorary degrees from the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Edinburgh, Durham, and King's College, London. The crowing reward and happiness of his life came in his appointment as librarian of the Pusey Library and First Principal of Pusey House, Oxford. But we like to think of him as the quiet saint and seer who believed in the ideals of the spirit as firmly as he believed in the dogmas of theology. What difference does it make, after all, what a man believes, if only he "doeth the will"? And if such a man as Bishop Gore finds inspiration to such living in such doctrines, must there not be some rare spiritual content in them?

Notes on Economic Recovery

The depression will not last forever. This conviction is shared even by those who believe we are destined to rush on down the steep place to the final smash-up of the existing economic order. Most people believe our society will soon recover at least to the point where economic life will be reasonably stable. The hope of a "return to normalcy" doubtless died with Harding. But our civilization will survive, however disfigured.

What is fundamentally the matter with us is a major dislocation of wealth. European confusion and weak finances, strained relations between European powers, a timid American psychology, excessive hoarding of currency,—these are, to be sure, phases of the situation. But the major fact with which forces of recovery have to deal is the passing of a large proportion of the common wealth out of the possession of those who up to recently owned and kept it turning over. Many stocks and bonds have changed hands. Nominal values of all or almost all have shrunk. But real values are still there and the present holders will eventually realize upon them.

In general, securities have passed out of the hands of small investors. While the total of savings bank deposits may have increased there have been many withdrawals, and other forms of savings have shrunk or evaporated. In general these securities formerly owned by small investors have passed into the possession of those who already had large holdings. Thus, during the depression, the poor have grown poorer, the well-to-do on the nether borderline have grown poor, the rich have become at least potentially richer, and, perhaps, certain of the well-to-do on the upper borderline have joined the ranks of the rich. No one can determine accurately the numbers in each group, but it is certain that the relatively few rich have become richer and the impoverished have become more numerous.

While all, rich and poor alike, have suffered loss in the general depreciation of securities, only the rich will profit by the recovery. When securities rise to their real value only large investors will gain, since, in general, they alone will hold securities; the small security-holder has been compelled to dispose of his holdings. He has sold often at crushing sacrifice. He certainly will be in no position to buy back his securities at the enhanced value which the recovery will give them. The recovery will therefore reveal a permanent and serious dislocation of wealth. Wealth will have largely passed out of the hands of those who can and would use it to stabilize the markets by their widespread buying, and it will have passed largely into the hands of those who will not and cannot use it in increased commodity buying; they already had enough to go

the limit in the purchase of necessities or comforts and even of luxuries. Their increased prosperity makes them no better buyers. They simply have greater ability to hoard.

This creates an intolerable condition. No recovery will be permanent which perpetuates it. One of two fundamental adjustments will be necessary. Either the excessive wealth of the rich must be taken away from them and restored to those who formerly owned it, or else new wealth must be found and made available to the deprived. The former alternative will not add to our total national wealth, but will subtract from the rich in the interests of the poor. The latter course will add to the total wealth, will leave the rich, made richer, in possession of their new holdings, and will distribute the new wealth in satisfying proportions among the impoverished.

The former method cannot be operated painlessly. If it were attempted, the rich would yell as though they were being killed. They must indeed be "killed", or banished, before they will submit. At least that has been the way in Russia and wherever else the course has been adopted. It has never been tried in American history.

In our own history only two great economic crises are comparable to the present. And, like this, they each followed a war. In each case the issue was met by draft upon theretofore untapped national resources, in the creation of vast new wealth, which wealth was made available in some large measure to the masses. Following the war for American independence and again following the Civil War the fathers floundered through morasses of depreciated currency, bank failures, business bankruptcies, falling commodity prices and all the rest of what we now know or have sufficiently foretasted. Then the few grew richer and the masses became intolerably impoverished.

After the war for independence there followed the opening of the great northwest, as it was then called, that is, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, Tennessee, Michigan, the so-called prairie states. Roosevelt called the process the "winning of the west." The rich along the Atlantic seaboard did not let go the wealth with which the great dislocation incident to the war had endowed them. They held on and got a liberal share of the new prosperity which was created by the tide of population surging beyond the Alleghenies. But the impoverished got access to the new wealth. They, indeed, created it by prodigies of daring and of resourcefulness—by all the manifold virtues of the pioneer.

This course was almost exactly duplicated following the Civil War, only the goal of the pioneer was then the plains and mountain states, and the coastal areas along the Pacific. The surges of emigration to this farthest west during the 'seventies, 'eighties and early 'nineties of the past century constitute one of the marvels of our history. The terrible depression of the 'seventies, in twenty years under this spell of creative economic energy, so rapidly gave way to popular contentment that the historian of all time, as well as the cartoonist of our day, will continue to dub the latter decade "the gay 'nineties."

If it were in point we might analyze both periods to show how the new wealth thus created eventually was lodged disproportionately in the possession of the already rich, giving occasion to the popular revolt embodied, on the one hand, in the successful political agitation of Andrew Jackson, and on the other hand, in the onslaughts of Theodore Roosevelt upon "malefactors of great wealth."

The issue raised by Roosevelt was not settled when the world war came on. The election of Wilson in 1912 carried forward the popular revolt, in spite of the fact that he defeated the same Roosevelt in the three-cornered contest of that year. Up to the outbreak of the world war the inordinately wealthy were more and more vigorously challenged.

Since the war they are believed to have dominated American statesmanship. The long tenure of Mr. Mellon in the United States treasury has given much countenance to this belief. Yet even in the midst of the Coolidge prosperity there was much restiveness over the inequitable distribution of the common wealth. What will be the popular discontent when on the recovery of industry from this depression the recent enormous dislocations of wealth shall be popularly appreciated and appraised! The impoverished masses will not be appeased by the new *status quo*. As already remarked, one of two courses is inevitable: existing wealth must be redistributed or new wealth must be created and made accessible to the millions impoverished by the depression.

The financial powers of today, and government, no matter of which party, will prefer the latter alternative; they will wish to see some vast new national resources opened up. Where are these resources? They must call forth the pioneering spirit, and above all, they must give the common man a chance. New territory to meet these requirements? Where is it to be found? Alaska's five hundred thousand square miles offer adequate area, perhaps, but if our conservation laws did not daunt the homesteader the climate and the character of the terrain would do so. Alaska may be a treasure house for the highly capitalized exploiter, but for the individual pioneer endowed only with two hands and a courageous heart it falls short of requirements.

Will the vast vacant spaces of our already occupied domain be made available and attractive to the stifled dweller in our overgrown cities? How? The present strong tendencies in American agriculture

would have to be reversed. The bare-handed pioneer would certainly not be equal to the situation, however stout of heart, unless both agricultural production and commodity distribution were radically re-ordered.

Will new industries spring up to meet the requirements? Where and of what sort? Consider the bare-handed pioneer again. It takes capital to start or maintain modern industry. Staking the pioneer in industry involves risk. Will capital in the hands where it is now massed be adventurous? The prospect is not promising.

New industries there will certainly be and perhaps adventurous expansion of certain existing industries. But the watchword of American industry has long been and will continue to be "efficiency." That means "produce the maximum with the minimum of labor." We are told that the depression has taught industrial and business management such drastic lessons that with the recovery it will be possible to attain former prosperity standards with the employment of 65% of the former personnel. The new order must therefore provide for such an industrial expansion as will not only quell the discontent which was already growing vocal if not turbulent among the unemployed under Coolidge prosperity, but it must also insure the employment of the 35% of labor let out by depression-inspired efficiency methods. This is a large order. Hoopla and Ballyhoo will not meet the issue. Sound industrial and business management must show its metal if it leads the way out and on.

In the perspectives of history the alleged financial wizardry of Alexander Hamilton and Albert Gallatin loses much of its glamor. They had the benefit of vast new resources and a pioneer creative energy which has probably never been duplicated except in our own national history. They appeased the hungry masses and replenished the national treasury by no concessions exacted from the rich. They not only left the rich undisturbed in their new holdings of securities acquired for a song, but they so ordered the national economic program that the rich also profited greatly from the new prosperity. Their statesmanship, if statesmanship their policies can be called, appeared in opening doors to the masses where their creative energies might have independent play and where the rewards of their almost incredible labors were not too niggardly.

In the recovery after the Civil War when our society was still bewildered and impoverished by a depreciated currency, the slogan "The way to resume specie payment is to resume," was hailed as inspired statesmanship. As a matter of fact was it other than brute plunging? The lavish spending of the federal government during the war, and the riotous speculation which immediately followed the war, could not in the orderly operations of economic laws be atoned for by arbitrary declarations like "Let us resume!" The national currency was depreciated for cause, and when no real reckoning was made of this cause, the arbitrary restoration of the dollar to par planted the seeds of social evils from which we continue to suffer. The abrupt resumption of specie payment endowed the rich with fabulous profits. Securities of scarcely any value, held by the rich in large quantities, suddenly took on gilt edges. Popular resentment over this process was restrained by the absorption of the masses in their prodigious new pioneering labors, out of which they hoped to gain independent wealth on their own part. In their zeal to share the new wealth the poor were blinded to the processes by which the rich seized the old.

Will the impoverished of today and tomorrow be thus blinded? Where are new resources, capable of being exploited independently by the bare-handed pioneer? If the new wealth is not of satisfying volume or if it is not brought within the reach of the impoverished masses, the means by which the old wealth has come into the hands of its present holders will not be overlooked by the deprived. The Coolidge prosperity inflated securities enormously. Is the depression going to be allowed to deflate them permanently? If not, if we are to "maintain the gold standard," if the water in old stocks is not to be squeezed ont, then vast new wealth must be found somewhere for the impoverished masses, to forestall their open and perhaps turbulent revolt.

Here is the challenge of the times to statesmanship.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE

Jottings

Times aren't so bad! "Babe" Ruth is scorning a salary contract of $70,000 a year.

We have a great idea! Let Mayor Walker, of New York, go to Manchuria and meditate peace there between Chinese and Japs. Then let the Japanese commanding general and his army come to New York and clean up the bandits there. Think of how happy Manchuria would be to get rid of war—and the Japs; and how happy New York would be to get rid of banditry—and "Jimmy" Walker!

A propos of Japan in Manchuria, we suppose that when Julius Caesar was fighting the Gallic Wars, he was really chasing bandits. And come to think of it, that must have been what took Napoleon to Moscow!

The spectacle of Andrew Mellon's aluminum com-

pany accepting huge contracts from the Soviets is edifying. These politicians can't, or won't recognize the Bolsheviks, but they are tickled to death to do business with them.

Two billion (2,000,000,000) dollars for the frightened bankers, but not one cent for the starving unemployed. This is President Hoover's idea of democracy!

Two spiral nebulae have been discovered speeding away from the earth at the rate of 15,000 miles a second. Well, we don't blame them. If we could get away from this earth, we would move 30,000 miles a second.

J. H. H.

The Evolution of the Soul*

I am conscious of the honor that has been conferred upon me in the invitation to deliver the Ayres Lecture on "The Evolution of the Soul". I am no less conscious of my limitations to deal adequately with this great theme in an age which has challenged every belief and attempted to revaluate many of the ideas that have been sanctioned by time, and to test the hopes hallowed by experience. Many and various are the difficulties that confront us. The subject itself is very large and its ramifications are numerous. To mention but a few, one might approach it from the philosophical, the psychological, the scientific, the theological, the moral, the rational, and the mystical points of view.

The very word "soul" does not mean the same thing to any two people in the world. Soul is a concept and like all other concepts has undergone many changes throughout the course of centuries. It is therefore altogether proper to speak of "The Evolution of the Soul" if we keep in mind that what we are really discussing is the evolution of the *concept* of the soul, rather than the evolution of the soul itself. Both, of course, have evolved.

In almost every language, the word soul denotes a spiritual entity, or psychological activities which, it not the cause of the life of the body, yet forms the spiritual antithesis to body, which is a material entity.

If we, who are somewhat accustomed to deal with abstractions and metaphysical entities, find it difficult to define soul in any but the most general and vague terms, it is only natural that the primitive man whose metaphysics was less adequate even than ours, should have nothing more than adumbrations rather than definite concepts. These, however, were so universal among various peoples between whom communication was impossible, that the very existence of the gropings is in itself significant. Anthropologists agree that there was no savage tribe so crude, even those that did not cover their nakedness or cook their food, and at the same time no civilization so advanced that did not bear witness not only to the faith in the existence of the soul but also in its continued existence. The half-naked tribes of darkest Africa, the Aborigines of Australia, the uncivilized inhabitants of Torres Straits Island, the barbarians of New Guinea, the half-developed Melanesians, the Troglodytes, the Tougans, the Fiji Islanders, the people of Nonumbo, the Tarahumares, the black feet Indians of Saskatchewan, the Aztecs of Mexico and Peru and the American Indians—all had intimations of the existence and persistence of the soul.

Primitive man felt that behind the visible and the tangible, there was something invisible and intangible which was more real, and that something was *spirit*. He felt that these hidden powers were the prime realities. Primitive man believed in animism: everything had a soul, the tree, the grove, the stream and the person. It was the soul that gave a person distinctiveness. The soul was "the life of the body."

Among cannibals even today, it is believed that by eating another body, one acquires additional "soul power", life and strength. Many cannibals devoured their dead kinsmen to keep their souls intact from generation to generation. The soul frequently was felt to be in the blood. That accounts for such prohibitions as are found in the Book of Genesis 9:4, "Only flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat." It was the *blood* of Abel that cried for vengeance.

Among many early peoples, the belief was that the seat of the soul was in the heart. The old Egyptians, for example, would frequently prepare a special vessel for the burial of the heart, symbolic of life, whose real essence was to be found in the heart. Among other primitive beings, the soul was thought to be the breath. A similar example of this is found in Genesis 2:7, "God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living *soul*."

The Hebrew word "nephesh," the Greek words "psyché" and "pneuma," as well as the Latin, "anima" and "spiritus," all bear testimony to the original identification of the *soul* with the *breath*. The Roman custom of catching the last breath of their dying kinsmen, was a sublimation as well as a substitution for the cannibalistic custom of devouring the dead bodies of their kinsmen.

Among the American Indians, the soul was frequently symbolized by a flame, possibly because the body is warm and the corpse is cold, and possibly also because the body, like a flame was constantly changing and moving while remaining essentially the same.

Other primitive peoples looked upon the soul as a kind of *shade* or possibly a *shadow*. The shade was emblematic of neutrality which, for many primitive people, represented the status of a disembodied spirit.

Others, still, identified the soul with a *name* of a person. It was that which gave a person distinctiveness, even though, in large manner, it was through the processes of mental association. The custom of naming people after dead relatives in order to keep family continuity unimpaired, may have originated in this way. Not infrequently among early peoples—and there are survivals of this practice today—names of sick persons were changed, not so much to deceive the Angel of Death who had a summons for a particular soul, that is, for a definite name, but because it was felt that the *name* was all but identical with the *soul*.

*Lecture delivered under the auspices of the Ayres Foundation.

The ancient Egyptians had little, if any, talent for dealing with abstract or philosophical thought. Their interest in the life of the soul centered largely upon its future fortunes. Gods, as well as men, were thought to possess souls. It was looked upon as a seat of courage and strength. Our oldest source of information, the Pyramid Texts, deals with the posthumous destiny of kings. The souls of other men were thought to remain in the underworld or to wander in the desert. There is sufficient evidence to believe that the old Egyptians had a kind of purgatory, a period for examination in the underworld, to decide the future destiny of some particular soul. The future life was a material paradise preserved for kings and for the pure, while the wicked were doomed to destruction by demons who inhabited the underworld. When Osiris was believed to be the great Judge, according to Egyptian literature, he was attended by forty-two Egyptians who bore such terrifying names as "Blood-drinker," "Bone-Breaker," and "Shadow-Swallower."

The soul, under the name of *"Ba,"* was conceived in the form of a bird, carrying with it the implication that the liberation of the soul from the body would carry the former to unfathomable heights. In addition, there was another name for soul, *"Ka,"* which in reality represented a man's "double," a kind of a guardian angel which joined man for eternity, in the life hereafter. Herodotus claimed that the Egyptians were the first to believe in the immortality of the soul. Somewhere in Egyptian literature, the moral element entered in when they spoke of being "worthy of immortality." The Books of the Dead, the Egyptian Scriptures, take the continued existence of the soul after death for granted. This is the strongest form of evidence for their belief.

One finds it difficult to speak of the Greek view of the soul. There wasn't *one* Greek view, there were *many*. Recent excavations have shown that in very early Grecian days, people believed that the soul dwelt in the tomb. While Homer and Hesiod represent the Greek religion in its cruder and less developed form, they too, used the word, "psyche," as synonymous with the last breath, or ghost, which a man "gives up when he dies." It was therefore quite natural for the early Greeks to believe in cremation so that a soul might be entirely free from the body after death. To both Homer and Hesiod, the soul had little, if any importance, during the life of man. Like all the literary Greeks, Homer used words with great discrimination and precision. The word, "soul" represented the functions of the body, if not the source of such functions. As the soul was not the seat of consciousness in the body, it was not a disembodied consciousness after the death of the body. Immortality, to Homer, consisted in exemption from the separation of soul and body. In Hesiod, there are many primitive survivals, but no real hope for life after death, in the generally accepted sense of the word. Even the gods were immortal only because they had immortal bodies. With the spread of the worship of Dionysius, a new idea emerged in the form of mysticism in which "ecstasy" and "stepping out" of the body, which was a prison or tomb of the soul, came into existence.

With the coming of the Ionian physicists in the fifth century B. C., there was a scientific attempt to find that which was "ageless" and "deathless." Again, there was the quest for the presence behind the appearance. Possibly Pythagorus was the first to regard the soul as the "self," which both Orphic believers and Homeric followers had failed to do. He introduced the doctrine of reminiscence which naturally paved the way for reincarnation, and in thus making the soul the seat of knowledge, gave it an individuality of its own.

Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle represent Greek thought at its best. We are fortunate in possessing Plato's "Apology" depicting the trial and death of Socrates. Nothing, possibly, is more sublime in all literature. Socrates had no doubt that the soul was a definite spiritual entity, and that it left the body at death, and that it could not be apprehended by anyone.

Plato's concept of soul was naturally inseparable from his "theory of ideas." The *idea* was a reality; everything on earth was but a copy of the reality that existed in the realm of ideas. From the Platonic point of view, not only was the soul a reality, but it was *the* reality, the *only* reality in man. As such, it was not only imperishable, but preexistent.

Aristotle was greatly influenced by Plato's ideas of soul, and spoke of "achieving immortality." "We ought not to listen to those who exhort man to keep to man's thoughts, but so far as may be, to achieve immortality and do what may to live according to the highest in him." (Aristotle Ethics x7).

Immortality of the soul could therefore be achieved best by *living immortality here and now,* by holding on to those things that have eternal over against ephemeral value.

With Plotinus, Neo-Platonism began its emphasis upon the spiritual side of man, capable of mystical identification and communion with God.

It is very difficult to formulate the Roman concept of soul. Romans were not given to speculation until the century of the Republic when they were under the influence of Greek philosophy. It is true that they contributed the word, *"anima,"* but in all probability, it means little more than *"breath."* When the Romans used the word *"soul,"* they frequently spoke of it in the plural, and doubtless referred to the dead generally, to the numbers who were slain on the field of battle. The soul as an individual entity, as an emanating principle of life which persists after the death of the body, was not found in Roman literature until Ennius, 169 B. C. In reality, we was a Greek and well acquainted with Greek literature in general, and Pythagorean philosophy in particular. He alludes to the Pythagorean doctrine of reincarnation, and also mentions the Homeric shades of the nether world. During at least a century of war and money-getting, the Roman mind was almost oblivious to the concept of soul and indifferent to speculation about souls, whether of individuals, or of the gods. Later on, the Stoics contributed a concept of soul as part of "universal reason," and even then, there was little speculation, if any, about the soul's existence after death. A revival of Pythagoreanism in the age of Cicero furnished an interest in the soul and its fate.

Cicero himself was a doubter, and so was Caesar. Catullus wrote of death as, *nox-perpetua.* Lucretius naturally glories in the destruction of the soul at death. His was the doctrine of Epicurean materialism. Tacitus was interested only in the immortality of good and great deeds. Pliny the Elder spoke of death as, "relapsing into the nothingness in which we were before birth." "The horror of being forgotten by the living" seems to have been their only concern. The

deification of the soul of an emperor did imply a belief in the survival of souls of great men. This idea is found in the poets and especially in Virgil, but even so, not deeply rooted in Roman ideas. What the emperor himself thought of soul is well expressed in Hadrian's lines of "regard for some life left behind rather than any hope in entering on a dim journey into the unknown."

The Hindus, from the earliest times, believed that the soul was distinct from the body, and survived it after death. It was evident among other ways in ancestor worship. About the seventh or eighth century B. C., the belief in transmigration or reincarnation arose. It was based upon the doctrine of moral requital. A man's soul lives many lives on earth, and reaps in the later lives, the moral harvest sown in the earlier ones. It is therefore rather easy for the Hindus to solve the eternal riddle as to why the righteous suffer, and why the wicked prosper. Since the processes of life had no beginning, and will have no end, happiness and misery, prosperity and adversity, were caused by the actions of the soul in previous existences. The soul, if good, could through accumulated credit, arise to be a royal person, or possibly even a god; and if bad, could sink to the depth of a devil or an animal. Later Hindu thought identified man's soul with abstract impersonal intelligence.

In Buddhistic literature it is difficult to find a word to compare, either in denotation or connotation, for "soul." The contrast between man's body and his spiritual nature was largely in terms of man's sentient life, and characterized by his breath. The Upanishads describing the cult of *Atman,* also called *Brahmin,* pointed to the existence of a kind of universally immanent deity that lived in the human organism. It represented some sort of microcosmic divinity which had the same qualities as a macrocosmic divinity, the attribute of permanence remaining undisturbed by the impermanence of the body at death. To discern the identity between microcosmic and macrocosmic, was to appreciate the value of the function of the soul.

The ancient Semite believed that man consisted of two parts, the outer part, flesh and bones, and the inner, an impalpable breath. Only gradually did he come to think of the spirit, or soul, as separate from the body. It is interesting to note that in the various dialects of the Semitic language, the word, "soul," as a noun was derived from a verb root which meant "to breathe." In the course of time, naturally there was development. In the Samarian language, there were two idiograms for "napistu," which means "breath." The one pictured a growing reed by running water, symbolical of abundant life; the other expressed it through the medium of an eye, the brilliance of the flame of which expressed the vigor of one's life.

Among the Babylonians, the concept of life dealt not so much with the possession of a soul, but the ability to stand forth as a distinct being, which came nearer to our idea of individuality and personality, rather than to the metaphysical concept that we have thus far come upon so frequently. The Babylonians believed that when a man died, he carried on a dreary, cheerless existence in a subterranean cavern, with body partly decomposed. As they did not think of a soul as an entity independent from the body, they "poured water on the ground" above the grave to feed the body. The Gilgamesh Epic makes it clear that the souls of those who are deprived of life prematurely or through accident, roam the world and are therefore dangerous to the living.

Among the ancient Hebrews the word that comes nearest to the concept of soul, is "nephesh." It was used in many ways:—(1) as a principle of life, as in Gen. 2:7, "Jahweh breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life and he became a *living soul.*" This life principle was applied to animals as well as to man, and therefore, the ancient Hebrews were prohibited from eating meat from which the blood had not been drained, for "the blood is the life." (Deut. 12-22-24). When Elijah brings the child to life again in I K:17:22, the record states, "the *soul* of the child came into him again." (2) "Nephesh" also had been used to designate the source of physical appetites. (Deut. 12:15.20.21, Deut. 23:24, Num. 21:5, Job 33:20, Ps. 78:18, Ecc. 2:24, Mic. 7:1). (3) The word "nephesh" was also regarded as a reservoir for all kinds of emotion—pity for the poor, Job 28; of joy, Ps. 138:3, etc. (4) It was also regarded as a source of moral action, of the seat of the will and mental activity, Gen. 49:6, Deut. 4-29, Job 7:15, Ps. 13:2, Josh. 22:14. (5) "Nephesh" also was used to designate and differentiate persons, as in Gen. 14:21, "give me the souls and take the goods thyself," or in Lev. 17:5, "no soul of you shall eat blood," or Ez. 18:4, "the soul that sinneth, it shall die." When the souls of Jacob's descendants are enumerated, it clearly means persons. (6) When the word "nephesh" contained a pronomial suffix, like "nafshecho," meaning "thy soul," it merely meant "thyself."

Then came a curious development in which the word "nephesh," instead of designating a person who is living, was used to designate one who once lived, as in Lev. 19:28, Num. 6:6, Hag. 2:13. Although the soul was regarded as having long since departed from the body, the soul was still looked upon as the *real* person. The Hebrew Bible also used the words, "ruach" and "lebh," "spirit" and "heart," to designate that impalpable nature of man which has come down to us under the name of soul life. But the Hebrew concept was never trichotomous, body, soul and spirit, but was really a unity. The usages of both "ruach" and "lebh" can parallel those of "nephesh," which we have already enumerated. The Hebrew Bible contains only a few references to the seat of the soul after death. From Is. 14:9-11, the seat of the soul after death, seems to be that of a wretched existence in Sheol, a shadow world. From Ez. 32:27-32, Sheol, the abode of departed spirits is described as a subterranean region where the dead of all nations are collected, the inhabitants of which are called, "nephaim," or "helpless ones."

Among the earliest approximations to immortality in the Bible, we have Dan. 12:3, "And they that are wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn the many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever."

Later on, the faith in the immortality of the soul became one of the controversial problems between the Pharisees and Sadducees, the one believing in resurrection, and the other in immortality. The Christian idea of resurrection was taken from the earlier Sadducceean point of view. The necrology related in the First Book of Samuel, 28:17, with reference to King Saul and the Witch of Endor, points definitely to the belief in the existence of spirits after death. A num-

ber of other passages in the Old Testament seem to point to the immortality of the soul. Among them, we may point to Pr. 20:27, "The soul of man is the candle of the Lord," and Ecc. 12:7, "The spirit shall return unto God who gave it," and "For thou wilt not leave my soul in Sheol; neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption. Thou wilt show me the path of life: in thy presence is fulness of joy" (Ps. 16:10-11).

The Jewish view is the post-biblical view held by the descendants of the Hebrews, who after the Old Testament was canonized were more properly called Jews. The post-biblical views on the existence of the soul may be divided into three divisions, the Hellenic, the Rabbinic, and the Philosophical. Hellenic Judaism was influenced by Platonic ideas, and echoes of Plato's idea of the pre-existence of the soul are to be found both in Enoch, and in the writings of Philo. Philo accepts Plato's tripartite division of the soul as rational, spiritual, and emotional, but looks upon these as merely so many functions of the soul. When Philo speaks of immortality, only the rational part of this three-fold function occupies his thought.

In Rabbinic Judaism, which is largely Talmudic, there is a dualism of body and soul. The soul has two inclinations, one the inclination for good, "yetzer tob," the other, inclination for evil, the "yetzer hara." Over these inclinations, it is the soul of man that has control, and man therefore is responsible for his actions.

The post-biblical Hebrew word "n-shamah" comes nearest to the modern English word soul. In The Daily Prayer Book, the following prayer taken from Talmudic sources is significant: "My God the soul which Thou hast given unto me came pure from Thee. Thou hast created it, Thou hast formed it, Thou hast breathed it into me, and preserved it in me. Thou wilt take it from me and return it to me in the world to come" (Sabb. 32b and B. B. 16a).

The philosophical view was influenced both by Plato and Aristotle. Thinkers like Saadia, Maimonides and Crescas, who followed Aristotle's "Physics," were largely inclined to rationalism; while Gabirol, Halevi and Gersonides, who were influenced by his "Metaphysics," leaned towards mysticism. Maimonides felt that the soul possessed five faculties, the highest of which was reason, the power to discern the difference between right and wrong. Maimonides believed in *conditional or relative immortality* of the soul depending upon the degree in which the human soul approximated "sechel hapoel," the active intellect which is God.

The Chirstian point of view was greatly influenced by the parent religion. The New Testament followed the psychology of the Old Testament, though some scholars have attempted to exaggerate the Hellenic influence on the New Testament in regard to the Pythagorean contrast between the inner and the outer man. In the New Testament, one finds the equivalent for all the words of the Hebrew Bible designating soul, spirit, or personality. The Hebrew "nephesh" is paralleled by the Greek "psyche"; the Hebrew "ruach" is paralleled by the Greek "pneuma"; the Hebrew "lebh" is paralleled by the Greek "cardia."

The resurrection of Jesus, which was accepted literally by the early Christians, took the twofold problem of the existence of the soul and of the immortality of the soul out of the realm of speculation, and for them placed it in the domain of fact. The belief in resurrection was not distinctly Christian. It was prevalent among the Pharisees and found earlier in the Mithra Cult of Persia, in the case of Tammuz in Babylonia, of Attis in Phrygia, of Melkart in Tyria; of Osiris in Egypt, of Dionysius in Greece, and of Krishna in India.

Tertullian (160-220) and Origen (185-254) showed the influence of Stoic and Platonic psychology even though the former looked upon the soul as inbreathing of something corporeal, but gotten with the body, while the latter regarded it as pre-existent, as did the Alexandrians generally. In the time of Jerome, the theory of creationism was prevalent: "God is daily making souls while bodies come through human generation." Augustine (354-430) was deeply influenced by Neo-Platonism, and believed that the inner life was "sui generis" with intrinsic claim to retrospective study. Augustinian thought, however, did not become supreme until scholasticism became dominant. Then the Aristotelian concept of soul as life energy was mingled with the Platonic idea of body as the instrumentality of the soul. Aquinas (1224-75), who was the foremost representative of scholasticism, pointed to man as the central point of contact between the soul and body in the great realm of "form" and "matter."

The Koran was largely influenced by the Old Testament and contains the Arabic word "nafs," parallel to the Hebrew "nephesh," and also the Arabic word "ruh," which is parallel to the Hebrew "ruach." According to the Koran, the soul has its seat in the heart, and is described as "heart, hearing, and sight." Like the Talmudic concept, the soul has two propensities, one for good, and one for evil. The Koran contains little about the soul's continued existence after death, with the exception of "when the pious die, Allah brings their souls nearer unto himself, and keeps them there until he unites them again with their recent bodies at the day of Judgement." (L xxx 1:7).

A common and popular belief among the Moslems was to the effect that the soul departs from the body by way of the mouth, while others believed that it left by the back of the head.

Moslem theology also contained ideas of purgatory and the purification of the soul. It was believed that the soul can leave the body, and often does, during sleep, and on the day of resurrection will return to the renovated body. The idea of the soul as a purely spiritual entity constituting the essential nature of man, and continuing after death, was held by only a few of the Moslem theologians.

The spiritualist tendency regarding the soul as distinctive from the body was found among the mystics, and in somewhat modified form, among the theologians. The speculation of the Moslem philosophers showed little originality, either in their metaphysics or their psychology, insofar as the doctrine of the human soul was concerned.

In almost all ancient and medieval literature, the soul is something that man *has*. While this is true also of most modern writers, the tendency today is, that man *is* a soul, rather than that he *has* a soul. Two theories of life have long held the center of the stage of thought, and presented in terms of a forced alternative; if you select one you reject the other; if you reject one you involuntarily select the other. I have reference to vitalism and mechanism. Vitalism has its diffi-

culties with evolution. Mechanism cannot account for consciousness. Until only comparatively recently it never occurred to man that *both* theories are inadequate. Though Alfred Wallace the co-discoverer with Darwin of the Theory of Evolution, had pointed out that early in man's history the physical development of the body was arrested in favor of his mind, it remained for Morgan to substitute for both vitalism and mechanism, the "emergent evolution" theory. When hydrogen and oxygen come together in proper proportion the result is not a mixture but something new and altogether different from each and from both. In like manner, the soul, possibly, is an emergent of the evolutionary process.

The highest development of the human being, in the evolutionary process is found in personality. The question, "If a man die, will he live again?" is as difficult to answer today, as it was in the time of Job. In the last analysis, faith in the continued existence of the psychic life of man after the death of the body, is an adventure in the realm of faith. This represents both the poetic point of view, as well as that of uncritical religionists.

> Thou wilt not leave us in the dust;
> Thou madest man he knows not why,
> He feels that he was not made to die—
> Thou madest him; thou art just.

Otherwise, man's life on earth, would be comparable to the huge figure in the Via Larga which the tyrant Pietro commanded Michael Angelo to scoop out of the snow, only to have it melt beneath the merciless rays of the Italian sun.

Modern man also approaches the problem of the continued existence of the psychic life through the moral realm. Whatever be the standard of measure, whether health, or wealth, or prosperity, or longevity, the suffering of the righteous, and the prosperity of the wicked, point unmistakably to the fact that justice does not reign in this world. Without justice the world would not be reasonable and as Thomas Huxley pointed out, we could not reason about an unreasonable world. It is rather difficult to believe that there will or can be one and the same end for the saint and sinner, the nun and the prostitute, the martyr dying for an ideal and the vicious gangster shot in cold blood. The moral nature of man inherently revolts against the thought that Lincoln and his assassin, Nero and Savonarola, the innocent victim and the heinous fiend, should share the same fate. Unless, therefore, somehow, somewhere, someday, and some way, there be some kind of a reckoning, man could no longer believe in the justice of God, and life would be little more than "a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

Then again, there is a modern scientific approach to the problem, in terms of "the conservation of energy and the indestructibility of matter," which is merely a scientific way of saying that matter and energy are immortal. If it is true of physical energy, why should it not be true of psychic energy?

Thomas Edison, in 1910 said:

> I cannot believe in the immortality of the soul . . . there is no more reason to believe that any human brain will be immortal, than there is to think that one of my phonographic cylinders will be immortal.

After many years of thought, some sixteen years later, he said,

> If there is any evidence on the one side or the other, worthy of consideration by the scientific mind, it is in favor of the theory of immortality . . . the thing which I urge on religious teachers, is to pile up the sort of evidence which no fool skeptic can demolish.

Edison had come to realize that while immortality cannot be proven, its opposite, mortality, cannot be proven. With a truly scientific mind, he was not ashamed to change his views, but was willing to lean toward "the probabilities of case," which alone would make "sense out of the world." Martineau was right when he said, "we do not believe in immortality because we have proven it, but, we forever try to prove it because we believe it."

Sir William Osler, who in one of his books discussed the problem of immortality, used a very striking analogy. If unborn twins could discuss matters, they could convince each other that death would be certain the moment they were born, because their respiration, their circulation, their feeding—all would be different. Yet, twins are born—and live. Who knows, but that in this mysterious universe, we, the unborn twins who can muster up so many theories that seem to destroy faith in our continued existence, will yet find nature refuting our embryonic speculations?

Professor Arthur Compton, my colleague at the University of Chicago, a Nobel Prize winner in Physics, who has so often been quoted and more frequently been misquoted, on the subject of the immortality of the soul, while admitting that science cannot *prove* either the existence of soul or its immortality, yet expresses his profound faith in the following words:

> Permit me now to come away from our scientific reasoning, and present a scientific analogy which though of no value as an argument may yet be suggestive of possibilities. Where does the light go when you put out the flame? Let us take the flame to represent the body and the light which comes from it the consciousness or soul. In a candle flame vapor comes from the wick and air comes from the side, forming a steady stream of burning gases passing continually through the flame. There is an intake of food and oxygen at one end, and an outpouring of waste products at the other. It is a kind of metabolism. The material of the flame is continually changing, just as the cells of the body change, yet the form of the flame remains the same. It is the same flame. But puff, and the flame is out! Is this the end? The flame is dead. What then? What is happening to the light? The flame was material made up of atoms and molecules; but the light is a different kind of a thing—electromagnetic radiation, flying away at tremendous speed. We know that if the candle was out under the open sky, its light was streaming into interstellar space, where it will keep on going forever. The flame was mortal, but the light which it gave was immortal. More than that, the escaping light carries with it the story of the candle's life.

Bergson once remarked that even though one may grow accustomed to hang one's coat on a certain nail, the disappearance of the nail would not imply the destruction of the coat. In like manner, he argued the decay of the body, in no way points to the mortality of the soul.

There is one aspect of the problem of immortality which, while strictly speaking, does not belong in a discussion of this kind, because it does not presuppose a person's conscious individuality after death, should none the less *not* be omitted. For want of a better name, I shall call it the permanence of personality. It could also be called the immortality of influence. The price of immortality, from this point of view, consists of the practice of immortality. Personality means more than individuality, though careless writers sometimes interchange the two. Personality represents the sum total of the psychic life of man, the plurality of psychic experiences comprehended in the unity of conscious-

ness. Each personality is unique because it represents a unique combination of partially unique characteristics. Personality is that specifically human something that envelops the life of an individual. It is the result of habits, of thought and of ideals so correlated and lived as to form a distinct whole, a spiritual entity, with a force of attraction for all who come within its emanating rays. It is invisible and intangible, yet probably the most potent and significant element in the life of man. It is as natural an emanation from character as are light and sound waves through the invisible ether.

Personality, while usually associated with the body, is more than the body. In fact, it is the most distinctive criterion that differentiates between people. Which is more real and enduring, the *body,* or the *personality?* "Dust thou art, and to dust thou returnest," sums up the past, present, and future of the body of prince and pauper, righteous and wicked, man and beast. What of the spiritual entity, the personality, or the soul, that envelopes the mortal frame? Who is the more real and enduring for us, a Faust, a Hamlet, a Job, a Prometheus—all of whom never had a body—or some Tom, Dick, or Harry, whose lives have never been touched by the ideal? Who is the more real and enduring for us, the character-moulding and ideal-inspiring force that emanates from a long-departed, yet ever-present Isaiah, Socrates, or Lincoln, who live on, in us and through us, or some whom we know in the flesh, and whose spirits are not charged with the ideal? The answer is evident. The body returns to the dust whence it came, but the spirit becomes part of the "divinity that shapes our ends."

Aside from, and in addition to, mere memory, there is a rational and logical, as well as inevitable and demonstrable, permanence of personality. For better or for worse, everyone of us influences infinitesimally little, or over-poweringly much, as the case may be, everyone with whom we come in contact. And each one so influenced by us affects everyone else differently because of the influence that we have exerted upon him. Even if this were the first moment of the existence of the universe, within a week, this never-ending chain of cause and effect would be so intricately interwoven that extrication, even if desirable, would be impossible. It must have been some such thought as this that caused one of the old Jewish Sages to say, as did Imanuel Kant later also, that "the world stands or falls because of the actions of one man." This mutually affecting others, and being affected by others, forms a reservoir of influence that cannot summarily be cast aside. Even as the air in a soap bubble that bursts is not lost but returns to its source, in like manner, the influence exerted by each in the nature of things, cannot disappear. In the last analysis, the world is influenced by every action of yours and mine. Of course, this influence may be as difficult to measure as an additional drop of water in the ocean, or the change in the nature of time when one fleeting moment is added to the eternity of the past in its onward flight toward the never attained eternity of the future. But it *is* there. In like manner, personalities are not new creations but the products of other personalities, of heredity, of environment, of effort, of choice and of association. When they leave their temporary and material home, the body, they do exist and continue to live on in influence.

Bergson, you may recall, has pointed out that this drop of water, or that moment of time changes the nature of the ocean, or of time itself, not only quantitatively but also qualitatively. A power more transforming and transfiguring than that of Midas of mythology, at whose touch everything turned to gold, is that of personality, for it is not only empowered to make everything like unto itself, but each personality so transformed, becomes an agent, capable of and intent upon transforming others, in the infinite chain of causes and effects that must endure unto eternity. If Henry Drummond was correct in his claim that there are "natural laws in the spiritual world," then the conservation of psychic energy in terms of the permanence of personality seems assured. A man's true life is not limited by time and space, but transcends the material and its measure. Personalities are contagious and tend to produce like in others. As fire kindles fire, enthusiasm inspires enthusiasm, one act of heroism becomes the incentive for another, so the elements compounded in personality, tend to reproduce themselves and form a light that radiates blessings, even into the thousandth generation. In the words of Scriptures, "the path of the just is as a shining light which shineth more and more into the perfect day." (Pr. 4:18)

What of the unjust, what of the unrighteous, have they no personalities? Do not the cruel and the insincere also influence those with whom they come in contact? Does not their every act count as a drop in the ocean of human experience? Of course, they do. To deny that, would be to deny the very thing that we have labored to prove. Man at heart is good. In the constant revaluation of values, the good is set up as an ideal and becomes permanent, while the bad is relegated to the past and in time is forgotten. Because more biographies are written of good men, and women, than of bad, it is necessary to change Shakespeare's words: "The evil that men do lives after them, the good is oft interred with their bones," to read, "The *good* that men do lives after them, the *evil* is oft interred with their bones." Give any school child ten minutes to write the names of all the good men and women of history that he can think of, and the same time to write the names of all the evil characters, and the good will out-number the evil ten to one. The Talmud says that "the righteous may be considered alive even after they are dead—alive in influence—while the wicked may be considered dead even while they are alive."

Man's hope for immortality will doubtless always remain an immortal hope. Man's true life is not that carved in the wood, or chiseled in stone, or cut in marble, or poured out in moulten metal, but that which is engraved upon the hearts and souls of men. If we build in wood, it is destined to rot before the atmospheric pressure of heaven; if we build in marble, it too, will crumble before the storms of time; if we build in iron and steel, it is destined to flow as water before the smelting process of the universe; but, if we build in human life, by transforming and transfiguring the lives of those with whom we come in contact, we build for eternity and influence the generations yet unborn!

Oh may I join the choir invisible
Of those immortal dead who live again
In minds made better by their presence, live
In pulses stirred to generosity,
In deeds of daring rectitude, in scorn
For miserable aims that end with self,
In thoughts sublime that pierce the night like stars,
And with their mild persistence urge man's search
To vaster issues.

LOUIS L. MANN.

Government As a Racket

We are about to engage in another futile conference to abolish armaments in a world that has nothing to take their place. As a world of nations we are not at present and never have been a community but an anarchy. Every nation is a law unto itself, a fact to which the smug hypocrisy of pious pacts and disarmament conferences but lends emphasis. The lack of a world parliament and a world court backed by a world police is utterly illogical in a world in which the various nations are themselves organized with parliaments and courts and police: but it is a fact.

There exist in the body politic a number of men who ignore the fact of legal organization within the nation. We call them racketeers and they have their own separate organization, a sort of state within the State. Citizens who are not good citizens—and the number seems to be increasing today in America, not without cause—have recourse to this lawless kind of organization when unsuccessful in business conducted legally or when they suffer or think they suffer from legal injustice. The good citizen upholds the law regardless of consequences, while using every honest means of changing the conditions that he deems unjust or provocative of injustice, and such conditions certainly exist.

Passing over the profiteering that is the most fertile source of racketeering, let us take a simple everyday court case which any reader could match from his own experience. One citizen, say a translator, sues another for the payment of his bill. As there has been no definite contract of so much a word or so much an hour, the judge has to decide whether the translation is a good one and the charge reasonable. Influenced possibly by protestations of the defendant calling the translation incorrect and the charge preposterous and declaring that he has got translations innumerable done at a third of the cost or less, the judge, acting as judges are quite prone to do, resorts to a compromise. While giving the decision to the plaintiff, he cuts his bill in two, although there has been no evidence that the translation is inexact or infelicitous or the charge excessive or unusual for the kind of work involved. This means that when the plaintiff's legal and other expenses have been paid, he is left without a cent for all his expert labor, and this mainly because the judge does not understand the translator's job. Every lawyer knows that the personal equation—that is to say the state of mind of judge or jury, as the case may be—is a very large factor in the administration of justice by our courts. So that special labor courts and arbitration courts for special kinds of cases, manned by people who have expert knowledge of the particular field, are a crying need, and are actually in existence in some countries, particularly Germany.

But meanwhile, in the absence of such a perfected legal system, what is our citizen to do who thinks he has been unjustly treated by the court? If a good citizen, he will smile and accept the decision, while possibly resolving to be more careful in future with whom he does business, and certainly resolving to use his influence to improve the machinery and personnel of justice. If not a good citizen, he may seek out some racketeer and request him to collect the bill for him and his own fee at the same time from the defendant, or else "beat him up"!

Now this latter course—the course of the bad or the ignorant citizen—crude and savage as it sounds today in the case of one citizen seeking justice of another in the same country, is precisely the course commonly prompted by our merchants and bankers when some foreign nation or national fails to pay up. There being no world court universally recognized and backed by police to which to appeal, our citizens have recourse to our government as a racket to wield the big stick over the head of the negligent debtor nation until it pays up, without the possibility of any impartial consideration of the way in which the debt has been incurred, the interest rate, the ability of the debtor to pay, or any other equities in the case. Thus in our international relations we are an organization of racketeers. Indeed, the analogy is all the truer from the fact that there actually exist a League of Nations and a World Court which we have so far steadily refused to join and improve. So that we are a nation of racketeers organized to do a racketeering business with a powerful army and navy and air force—the most powerful in the world—within a world organized or rather striving to organize itself on a basis of common law and finding the task immensely impeded if not absolutely blocked by our failure to give our hearty support and cooperation.

Is it consistent for the business man who does not like rackets at home to show so languid an interest in the effort to abolish them in international relations? And has he considered the effect upon other nations, for example Japan, of our action in Mexico, Panama, Haiti, Nicaragua and the rest? In view of such a freebooting record and our lukewarm attitude towards the League of Nations and the World Court, with what moral confidence do we approach Japan at this moment? And has the said business man also considered the effect upon our own national morale of the existence of government—presumably the very source of law and order—as a racket! Such a condition acts as a virus penetrating every vein and artery of our national life. Does he fondly imagine that our own domestic racketeers are so dense as not to feel the inconsistency and hypocrisy of a nation of business men who decry racketeering at home and practice it abroad?

The common administration of justice by courts and police is admittedly very imperfect, but it is infinitely preferable to the anarchy of private and national duels and racketeering. There is no excuse for national armies and navies and air-forces except the lack of a world organization for the formulation, administration *and enforcement* of international law. There never has been any kind of government possible, without the surrender of a certain amount of liberty by the individual units concerned. This is the price of peace. Shall we pay it; or do we prefer to waste the bulk of our national taxes on armaments and offer up the flower of our youth periodically upon the altar of the insane god of War?

C. GUILLET.

Correspondence

British Reign of Terror in India

Editor of UNITY:

The news items published in responsible American dailies (The New York *Times*, The Chicago *Tribune*, etc.) and journals (The *New Republic*, The *Nation*, etc.) indicate that India is virtually under martial law, and the "ordinances" inaugurated by the British government in India are worse than anything practiced by the government of the Tsar in Russia. Not only thousands are thrown into prison without any trial, but the British government approves condemning a political offender to death—without a formal trial. This policy of repression has been adopted to crush the Nationalist movement in India!!!

Some time ago a British statesman denied that political prisoners are flogged in India. The other day in Bombay a nine year old boy, Krishua Kanta, was not only sentenced for 4 years in a reformatory for "picketing," by a British judge. While pronouncing the sentence the judge told the child that he would be whipped in the reformatory, if he disobeyed orders. So British judges approve whipping of children!!

Today's New York *Times* publishes a news item that Indian Nationalist Boy Scouts are subject to seven years' imprisonment in a reformatory for peaceful "picketing"!

Mrs. Gandhi's statement in the court which has condemned her for six weeks' imprisonment clearly indicates that Indian women are mercilessly beaten by lathi-charges for peaceful picketing and participating in forbidden processions.

In Bengal alone there are more than one thousand political prisoners, who are known as "detenus" and who are never tried by any court; and recently several of them were shot dead and others were wounded by the British officials in a prison camp.

This policy of reign of terror has the full sanction of the Rt. Hon. J. Ramsey MacDonald and his cabinet. This is evident from the recent statement of Sir Samuel Haare, the Secretary of State for India!!

New York City

TARAKNATH DAS

A Third Party

Editor of UNITY:

I have read with interest your editorial regarding the League for Independent Political Action in your issue of January 4. As a member of the Socialist party, naturally I concur with your wish that dissatisfied liberals who have turned their backs on the Republican and Democratic parties would enter the Socialist party to build up its strength. I feel that the Socialist party is fully worthy of their support.

Nevertheless, the fact still remains that a tremendous number of them simply will not do this for sincere reasons. Are we, therefore, to let these thousands of public-spirited people flounder about helplessly for want of education and political expression? Speaking as a member of the Socialist party, I think this would be a tragic error.

When you say that "the League for Independent Political Action, it seems to us, moves not an inch," it appears to me that you are wide of the truth. To be sure, quite deliberately, as well as for many other reasons, we of the L. I. P. A. are not undertaking to organize around ourselves a third party movement; from the beginning, our movement has explicitly declared itself not a party or a potential party, but merely the instrument of education and unification through which eventually, when conditions are ripe, a new party might emerge. Nevertheless, I think it is fair to call to your notice the fact that we have definitely organized branches in forty-one cities throughout the country and have corresponding groups in forty-seven additional cities. Furthermore, we have State organizations in some ten States and are now entering upon a campaign of State organization which will permeate these States and others in the next few months. The membership of the League, to date, has exceeded by several hundred the estimate of those of us who organized the League in the beginning. We have never contemplated a mushroom growth into a movement which would "sweep the country" in some tempestuous outburst of resentment or enthusiasm.

We suffer, like all other social movements at the present time, from lack of funds, but we are neither moribund, disappointed, nor impoverished in public backing.

The relations between the L. I. P. A. and the Socialist party have been difficult at times as is natural and was to be expected. I think that for the most part, however, Socialists rather generally recognize the need of a political movement which will provide a home for those not ready to affiliate with the Socialist party but who will permit a considerable cooperation between the Socialist party as the left group of a broader unit, and the various elements which combine in the ranks of the L. I. P. A. I see, myself, no inconsistency whatsoever in working frankly and aboveboard for both groups and I trust that, as time goes on, the degree of cooperation between them will be increased through mutual understanding, rather than diminished.

DEVERE ALLEN.

New York, N. Y.

Money and Idealism

Editor of UNITY:

The letter by E. H. James in UNITY, January 4, roused in me so much of both pleasure and displeasure that I am moved to tell UNITY readers the reasons for my emotions.

Mr. James's praise for UNITY struck an answering chord in my own mind. I have long esteemed UNITY for its fearlessness and I should feel lost without its editorials which help me to form opinions on matters of importance because they so frequently give information that I do not find elsewhere. The spirit of uplift, of faith in the final triumph of the righteous cause, which permeates the magazine is so heartening that it must, I believe, put courage into the hearts of many who would otherwise despair when contemplating the bewildering complexities life spreads before our eyes day after day. So I heartily concur with Mr. James in his estimate of the value of UNITY abroad as well as at home.

But when he says: "If you had piles of money you would not have principles," I disagree. I don't believe a word of it! I do believe there are some persons, men and women alike, whose principles are, or would be, unaffected by possession of money. And I believe that the editors of UNITY and its contributors—most of them, anyway—belong to that class. I can't believe otherwise. I should have no use for UNITY if I thought its editors and most distinguished contributors were of the weathervane type! Are not such people hypocrites at heart? Surely, surely, they who stand so unflinchingly for justice, for peace, for progress, as do UNITY's editors, could not—*they could not*—be false to the principles they urge. There are here and there a few, men and women alike, who have been unspoiled by the possession of great wealth and have regarded themselves as custodians of what was to be used to benefit others. I believe those most closely connected with UNITY to be of that class and I have faith that, were they in possession of "piles of money," their first act would be to use it so that UNITY's influence would be rapidly enlarged for the purpose of "conquering the world."

Perhaps I have taken Mr. James too seriously. But anyway, that is how I feel about it!

LYDIA G. WENTWORTH.

Brookline, Massachusetts.

Contrast

Against the sky line massive towers
Stand tall and silver in the sun.
Each holds the wheat of many fields,
Millions of bushels—wheat enough
To make the bread to feed the world.

Over our city scattered homes
Hold scores of jobless, hungry folk;
Who do not have enough to eat.
And where the little children ask
For life-sustaining bread.

A. B. LEIGH.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 314)

these will I give thee, if thou wilt worship me. . . . But he said, get thee hence, Devil. Matt. 4:8-10.

11. Rend your hearts and not your garments. Joel 2:13.

12. Even now the axe lieth at the root of the trees: every tree therefore that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. Matt. 3:10.

13. Whenever you stand up to pray, if you have a grievance against anyone, forgive him; that your Father may also forgive your wrongdoing. Mark 11:25.

14. *Sunday.*

I will take no delight in your solemn assemblies, I will not regard the peace-offerings of your fat beasts, I will not hear the melody of thy viols. But, let justice roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream. Amos 5:22,23.

15. If the blind guide the blind both shall fall into a pit. Luke 6:39.

16. Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of repentance. Luke 3:8.

17. A certain lender had two debtors: the one owed 500 denarii, the other 50. So when they had not wherewith to pay, he forgave them both. Which of them will love him most? . . . He, I suppose, to whom he forgave most. . . . Thou hast rightly judged. Luke 7:41-43.

18. Zacchaeus said, The half of my goods I give to the poor: and if I have exacted aught of any man, I restore fourfold. Luke 19:8.

19. How oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? Until seven times seven. Matt. 19:21,22.

20. If you have faith as a grain of mustard-seed . . . nothing shall be impossible to you. Matt. 17:20.

21. *Sunday.*

Put up thy sword into its place: for all that take the sword, shall perish with the sword. Matt. 26:52.

22. O ye hypocrites: you know how to discern the face of the heavens; but, you cannot discern the signs of the times. Matt. 16:3.

23. Now, ye, the Pharisees, cleanse the outside of the cup; but, your inward part is full of extortions and wickedness. Matt. 23:25.

24. Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy. There is nothing hid, that shall not be revealed. Luke 12:1,2.

25. The Pharisee prayed thus with himself: God, I thank thee that I am not as the rest of men. Luke 18:11. The Publican prayed thus: God, be merciful to me a sinner. Luke 18:13.

26. The whole law is fulfiled in one word, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. But, if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another. Gal. 5:15.

27. If a man say, I love God and hateth his brother, he is a liar; for, he who loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen? 1 John 4:20.

28. *Sunday.*

The people honoreth me with their lips. . . . But their heart is far from me. Mark 7:6.

29. Keep yourselves from all covetousness: for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things that he possesseth. Luke 12:15.

March, 1932

1. Everyone that exalteth himself shall be humbled; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted. Luke 14:11.

2. Ye are they that justify themselves in the sight of men: but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is exalted among men is an abomination in the sight of God. Luke 16:15.

3. Think ye that those Galileans were sinners above all others, because they have suffered? I tell you, Nay: but except ye repent. Ye shall in like manner perish. Luke 13:2,3.

4. If they hear not Moses and the prophets: neither will they be persuaded, if one rose from the dead. Luke 16:31.

5. They bind heavy burdens and lay them on men's shoulders: but, they themselves will not move them with their finger. Luke 11:46.

6. *Sunday.*

But in vain do they worship me: teaching as their doctrines the commandments of men. Matt. 15:9.

7. All their works they do to be seen of men; for they enlarge the borders of their garments and love the chief seats, and salutations; and to be called, Lord. Matt. 23:5-7.

8. But be not called Teacher: for one is your teacher, all ye are brothers. Matt. 23:8.

9. Woe unto you, hypocrites: because ye shut the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye enter not in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering in to enter. Matt. 23:13.

10. Blind guides that strain out the gnat, and swallow the camel. Matt. 23:24.

11. Woe unto you, for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, outwardly beautiful, but full of dead men's bones. Matt. 23:27.

12. Woe unto you, for ye tithe mint, and have left undone the weightier matters of the law, justice, mercy and faith: but these ye ought to have done and not to have left the others undone. Matt. 23:23.

13. *Sunday.*

They did not confess it, lest they should be put out of the synagogue: for they loved the glory of men more than the glory that is of God. John 12:42, 43.

14. See ye all of these buildings? There shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down. Matt. 24:2.

15. We must obey God rather than men. Acts 5:29.

16. Ye stiff-necked in heart: as your fathers did, so do ye. Ye who have received the law, and kept it not. Acts 7:51,53.

17. Where jealousy and faction are, there is confusion and every evil deed. James 3:16.

18. The fruit of righteousness is sown in peace for them that make peace. James 3:18.

19. And before him shall be gathered all the nations: and he shall separate them one from another as the shepherd separates the sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on the right hand but the goats on the left. Matt. 25:32,33.

20. *Sunday.*

Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be named sons of God. Matt. 5:9.

21. Whence come wars? Come they not from your pleasures that war in your members? Ye lust and have not: ye kill and covet, and cannot obtain: ye fight and war: ye have not because ye ask amiss, that ye may spend it in your lusts. **James 4:1-3.**

22. Whosoever shall seek to gain his life shall lose it: but whosoever shall lose his life shall preserve it. Luke 9:24.

23. And the soldiers of the governor took Jesus, make sport of him and took him away to be crucified. Matt. 27:31.

24. The soldiers, therefore, took his garments, and made four parts, to every soldier a part; and they sat and watched him there. Matt. 27:35.

25. Father, forgive them, for they do not know what they are doing. Luke 24:34.

26. Judgment is without mercy to him that hath shown no mercy; mercy glorieth against judgment. James 2:13.

27. *Easter Sunday. How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace.* Ish. 52:7.

Phone Oakland 0489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in
HARDWARE
AT
JOHNSON'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs,
Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

Back Up the Poetry Editors of UNITY, LUCIA TRENT and RALPH CHEYNEY
by buying their new joint book:
DREAMERS' HOUSE
SAID OF THIS BOOK:
"A bright, brave book!"—E. Mirick.
"A unique book by two of America's most lovable poets."—A. M. Stephens.
SAID OF THEIR PREVIOUS BOOKS:
"Lucia Trent need not write another line to make certain her shining immortality." The English Journal. "Final evidence of poetic genius." John Haynes Holmes.
"What I call poetry." Robert Frost. "There is the burning heart of life in your verses." Wm. Ellery Leonard.
Foreword by Glenn Ward Dresbach. Publisher: Robert Packard & Co., Chicago.
$1.60 postpaid
Order, autographed, from its authors at
259 SOUTH 44th ST., PHILADELPHIA, PA.